SENSE-OF-THE-SENATE RESOLUTION
REPORT REGARDING ATHLETIC GENERAL FUND BUDGET

Whereas, the SJSU Academic Senate has considered the issue of athletics spending several times over the past dozen years, consistently concluding that general funding spending on athletics does not meet the core mission of the university and therefore should be reduced; and

Whereas, general fund spending on athletics has not decreased and has, in fact, increased dramatically with no Senate input; and

Whereas, the report endorsed by the Executive Committee demonstrates that the cost of competing in NCAA Division 1A is enormous, probably exceeding 3 million SJSU General Fund dollars annually, and

Whereas, the funds now committed to Division 1A competition could provide for hundreds of course sections and improved library, counseling and other services important to faculty and students, and

Whereas, withdrawal from Division 1A would not exclude SJSU from serious intercollegiate competition, but would still, among other options, permit SJSU to compete in Division 1AAA in the Big West or elsewhere, and that such a move might actually increase the overall competitiveness and success of SJSU's athletics program, be it therefore

Resolved, that the Academic Senate endorses the report approved by the Senate Executive Committee, with the exception of the final section labeled "recommendation"; be it further

Resolved that the Academic Senate endorses the following recommendation in the place of the recommendation approved by the Executive Committee:

The Academic Senate recommends that annual university spending on the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics should be reduced to 1.8% or less of the university's general fund budget by AY 2005/06. Because it will not be possible to achieve this goal while remaining in Division 1-A, the Senate further recommends that Interim President Crowley or his successor immediately initiate the process of withdrawal from Division 1A and the WAC. The Senate further recommends that the budgetary savings achieved should be transferred to the Provost's and Student Affairs budgets and used to retain needed class sections, improved library and counseling and other academic and student services.
In 1993, the SJSU Academic Senate established a special committee to issue a report and make a recommendation regarding the percentage of the university’s general fund budget\(^1\) that should be allocated to the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics (DIA). The 5-person committee was in agreement that general funding spending on athletics should be limited, but was sharply divided over whether to recommend that the DIA should receive 1% or 2% of the university’s general fund budget. The committee voted narrowly (3-2) in favor of recommending a 1% cap. The full Academic Senate then debated this issue, which was just as divided as the original committee -- those advocating a 1% limit prevailed by a single vote (see SS-S93-12). This recommendation (which took the form of a Sense of the Senate resolution rather than university policy) was never followed.

In 2001, the Knight Commission released a report detailing the corrupting influence of money on intercollegiate athletics. This report also put forth a positive agenda for moving intercollegiate athletics closer to its academic roots. At the behest of then-President Robert Caret, in 2002 the SJSU Academic Senate passed SS-S02-4, which endorsed the Knight Commission report. It also called upon the president to issue a report on the state of intercollegiate athletics at SJSU, and for the Senate to then revisit its own 1993 report and issue “a follow-up.” President Caret’s successor, interim President Joseph Crowley, was responsive to the Senate’s request and delivered a report on intercollegiate athletics to the Senate in November 2003. The present document fulfills the Senate’s commitment to follow up on its own 1993 report.

In Fall 2003, the Executive Committee appointed a subcommittee consisting of Chair Annette Nellen, Past Chair James Brent, and Michael Katz, Chair of Professional Standards, to collect information and prepare an initial report for the committee’s review. This report draws upon information obtained from published accounts, budgetary documents, interviews, the various reports mentioned above, as well as information provided by the DIA in response to the subcommittee’s queries. Because this is intended as a follow-up to the Senate’s 1993 report, it largely addresses the issues raised in and adopts the format of that report.

---

\(^1\) The “general fund budget” can be differentiated from the “university budget.” The latter consists of all sources of revenue. The “general fund budget” includes both dollars from the state general fund as well as the State University Fee (SUF) that students pay to enroll in the CSU. It excludes items such as campus-based student fees (such as the Instructional Related Activity Fee or parking fees), as well as revenues generated by ticket or merchandise sales, fundraising, auxiliary charge-backs, etc. Consequently, the university budget is significantly higher than the general fund budget.
### Table 1. Overall DIA Budget Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>11,593,223</td>
<td>12,475,621</td>
<td>11,775,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>11,593,223</td>
<td>12,811,700</td>
<td>11,775,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(336,079)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*projected

### Table 2. Dollars from the General Fund to the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>5,526,243</td>
<td>6,407,608</td>
<td>6,751,374</td>
<td>6,852,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund % of DIA revenue</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gen. Fund</td>
<td>186,631,630</td>
<td>197,957,831</td>
<td>206,345,065</td>
<td>213,739,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA GF as % of Instructional Budget</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA GF % of University budget.</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*projected

### Table 3. Dollars from Instructionally Related Activity (IRA) Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Dollars</td>
<td>$652,595</td>
<td>663,300</td>
<td>770,738</td>
<td>798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA % of DIA revenue</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated

### Table 4. Dollars from Spartan Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Dollars</td>
<td>1,303,070</td>
<td>1,324,203</td>
<td>1,541,704</td>
<td>1,235,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation % of DIA Revenue</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Other Revenue (includes ticket sales, corporate sponsorships, broadcast fees, WAC payouts, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Dollars</td>
<td>3,577,273</td>
<td>3,198,112</td>
<td>3,411,805</td>
<td>2,889,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of DIA Revenue</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (NCAA Division; # of teams)</td>
<td>General Fund to Athletics</td>
<td>Total GF Allocation</td>
<td>Percent of GF to Athletics</td>
<td>FTES Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield (II, 17)</td>
<td>$2,134,000</td>
<td>$63,403,200</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose (IA, 16)</td>
<td>$6,751,374</td>
<td>$206,345,065</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (IA, 17)</td>
<td>$6,340,000</td>
<td>$246,596,000</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>27,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt (II, 12)</td>
<td>$1,993,398</td>
<td>$80,153,800</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno (IA, 17)</td>
<td>$2,899,023</td>
<td>$160,797,600</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>16,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills (II, 10)</td>
<td>$1,252,914</td>
<td>$84,104,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento (IAAA, 14)</td>
<td>$2,869,961</td>
<td>$191,052,800</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>21,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus (II, 13)</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$63,762,400</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach (IAAA, 14)</td>
<td>$3,292,628</td>
<td>$257,124,863</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>26,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco¹ (II, 16)</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$183,423,200</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>21,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona (II, 10)</td>
<td>$1,220,000</td>
<td>$160,024,200</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>17,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. (II, 11)</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$227,469,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>16,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma (II, 13)</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$65,636,800</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The president of San Francisco State University has announced that, due to the budget crisis, SFSU will be terminating all general fund support for athletics beginning in 2004/05. (Source: SFSU Athletics Director Michael Simpson)

2. Hayward is the only Division III school in the CSU. As such, the athletics department is not a stand-alone department but part of a regular academic department. It does not receive a separate budget. However, the department’s total budget in 2002-03 was $1.5 million ($127 per FTES).

*all data in this table pertain to 2002-03, with the exception of Long Beach & Sacramento, which are data from 2003-04. All data for San Jose, Fresno and Long Beach were taken from official budget reports. Data from remaining schools were reported by various administrators on the individual campuses. Specifically: Cindy Goodman, Business Manager (Bakersfield); Theresa Cuarenta (Dominguez Hills); Robert Scialdone, Assistant Athletics Director (Fullerton); Debby DeAngelis, Athletics Director (Hayward); Laurie Shephard, Athletics Business Manager (Humboldt); Lee DeLeon, Assistant Director of Athletics (Los Angeles); Roger Morehouse, Academic Senate Chair (Pomona); Bill Macriss, Associate Athletics Director (Sacramento); Michael Simpson, Athletics Director (San Francisco); Al Zitlau, Associate Athletics Director (San Diego); Bill Fusco, Director of Athletics (Sonoma); Dr. Milton Richards, Athletics Director (Stanislaus). Monterey Bay, San Marcos, Channel Islands & the Maritime Academy were not contacted. The remaining schools have not responded. Data regarding total campus general fund budgets were taken from Attachment A of CSU 2002/03 Budget. Data regarding FTES taken from a table entitled “CY 2002-2003 FTES Targets & Calculations” issued by CSU Academic Research.
Comments:

1) For the past three years, the DIA budget has remained relatively constant at just over 3.2% of the general fund budget. This is higher than in the early 1990s, when the percentage fluctuated between 2% and 2.5%.

2) Whether calculated as a percentage of the university general fund budget or on a per-student basis, San Jose State spent more of its general fund budget on athletics than any other university in the system for which data was obtained except Bakersfield. Division I-A schools tend to pay significantly more to support intercollegiate athletics than their counterparts do, although Bakersfield and Humboldt are exceptions.

3) In 2003/2004, the DIA did not receive a cut to its general fund budget. However, a temporary $82,000 cut to the previous year’s DIA general fund budget was made permanent. The DIA has seen its scholarship costs increase as a result of recent increases in the State University Fee (SUF). State law prohibits the use of general fund dollars to pay for scholarships for student-athletes.

4) The DIA ran a deficit of approximately $336,000 in 2002/2003, which it has agreed to repay over a three-year period.

5) As was true in 1993, football generates the sizeable majority of donations to the Spartan Foundation. It also generates the sizable majority of other, non-general fund revenue such as ticket sales and sponsorships.

6) Each semester, full-time students pay a $20 Instructional Related Activity (IRA) fee. Of this amount, $12.75 (63.75%) goes to the DIA, an amount that has not increased since 1991. In exchange for their IRA fees, students receive 5,000 free tickets to each home football game and 1,000 free tickets to each home basketball game, as well as unlimited free tickets to all other sports. Although student fee revenue as a percentage of the DIA budget has grown in the last 2 years, it is significantly lower than it was in 1993. Essentially, student fees have not risen and enrollments have been more or less stable, while the overall DIA budget has grown. Pursuant to an “IRA Adjustment Agreement” signed by President Gail Fullerton in 1991, the DIA is prohibited from requesting grants or other funding from Associated Students.

7) These budget figures do not include all athletics-related expenditures, such as the budget of the Office of the NCAA Compliance Director, which is in excess of $100,000.

Concerns:

1) Increased Reliance on the General Fund -- Since the Senate recommended limiting spending on athletics to 1% of the university general fund budget in 1993, that percentage has not decreased and, in fact, has increased rather dramatically.

2) Declining Revenues, Increasing Costs -- In its Spartans First master plan, the Division of Athletics states that it intends to increase its budget by $2 million a year by 2005 (Bell 2002, 3). In this plan, the DIA states that it will attempt to raise these funds through ticket sales, corporate sponsorships, higher student fees, and its advancement efforts. Two years after the adoption of that plan, those goals are not being met.

- In 2003/04, revenue from Spartan Foundation was down by 20% from the previous year.
- In 2003/04, athletic revenue, which includes ticket sales and corporate sponsorships, was down by 15%.
- The DIA’s plan for retaining Division I-A status relies in part on a $12.50 IRA (Instructional Related Activity) student fee increase, but in March 2003, students rejected
Measure Y, which contained a $6 IRA fee increase for athletics. No plans for seeking a new student fee increase have been made public.

- Due to the state budget crisis, it appears as though the CSU will be forced to turn away 30,000 students next year. Whether SJSU will experience an enrollment decline is uncertain, but if it does, the DIA will see its IRA revenue decline.

In other words, all of the DIA’s non-general-fund sources of revenue are flat or declining. At the same time, the Division’s costs are rising.

- New NCAA rules have required SJSU to increase the number of athletic scholarships that it offers.
- Governor Schwarzenegger’s most recent budget proposes yet another student fee increase (Halper 2004), which would further increase the DIA’s scholarship costs.
- New NCAA rules also require the team to play five home games each season, reducing the number of “body bag” road games it can play, reducing revenue by approximately $500,000 per year.
- The Division has increased marketing and operational costs due to the effort to retain Division I-A status. According to the DIA, the “bulk of the projected shortfall relates to the 2004 Division I-A requirements of 15,000 average home attendance” (Twining 2003).

In other words, the Division’s costs have been rising over the past few years, and they will continue to rise, at the same time that revenue is declining. Presently, the DIA can barely generate the revenue to meet its current expenses, yet it plans to increase spending by $2 million per year. If the DIA continues to adhere to its Spartans First plan, it is reasonable to expect that the pressure to spend more general fund dollars on athletics will continue indefinitely.

3) DIA General Fund Support Higher Than on Most Other CSU Campuses -- The DIA has presented data to demonstrate that athletics at SJSU would not be sustainable without Division I-A status. But the data from the other campuses in the CSU (Table 6) suggest that this is not the case. With the exception of Bakersfield, SJSU spends a larger percentage of its general fund budget on athletics than any other campus in the CSU for which data was obtained. In addition, Division I-A status seems correlated with higher per-FTES expenditures on athletics. In the meantime, other CSU schools are fielding a full complement of Division I and Division II teams on a fraction of the cost. If SJSU were to reduce its general fund budget for athletics to the level of Long Beach or Los Angeles, the university could save up to $4 million per year.

4) Lack of Connection to University Priorities -- Spending on Intercollegiate Athletics does not appear to support any of the budget priorities adopted annually by the President and the Academic Senate jointly since that practice began in 1997.2

5) Unpredictable, Unfunded NCAA Mandates -- The DIA must comply with NCAA mandates, mandates which often have significant monetary costs associated with them. For example, recent NCAA rule changes regarding attendance, home game, and scholarship requirements are the impetus for the current drive to increase DIA spending. As another example, whenever the alignment of teams in the Western Athletic Conference (WAC) changes, SJSU must adjust its travel budget accordingly. In other words, the NCAA is the source of significant, unfunded mandates over which SJSU has little control.

MAJOR CONCERNS REGARDING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The literature regarding intercollegiate athletics raises a series of concerns, many of which were discussed in the Senate’s 1993 report and which were reflected in the Knight Commission report, endorsed by the Senate in 2002. Specifically, the Knight Commission’s 2001 report,

---

2 Those priorities can be found at http://www2.sjsu.edu/senate/budgetmatters.html
identified three areas of concern: academics, the “arms race,” and excessive commercialization. We will briefly discuss how the DIA at SJSU relates to each of these concerns.

Academics – Overall, the Division of Athletics at SJSU appears to take the academic success of most of its student-athletes seriously. In virtually all categories, the graduation rate of student-athletes compares favorably with their peers both at SJSU and at other institutions. The DIA also provides several academic support structures for student-athletes, such as the CHAMPS Life Skills Program and the new Scott Gadway Academic Center. In addition, participation in intercollegiate athletics has afforded the opportunity to build bridges with other universities in common cause of academic goals, such as the WAC (Western Athletic Conference) Academic Alliance. This nascent group, headed by Provost Marshall Goodman, is a coalition of all WAC schools cooperating on joint research projects and curricular projects, a partnership that has the potential to pay dividends to SJSU.

However, more could be done to bring the DIA more in line with regular academic processes and governance. For example, the Executive Committee has recently learned that although many coaches are part-time faculty, the student evaluation form for coaches was not written or reviewed by the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB), but rather by the Athletics Board. SERB has received a Senate referral to address this situation. In addition, the Athletics Board as it is now constituted is selected largely by the president and reports solely to the president, meaning there is little regular, meaningful Senate review of the athletics program.

The “Arms Race” – The Knight Commission warns of the dangers of “an ever growing ‘arms race’ of spending and building to reach impractical financial goals.” San José State University is not in a position to realistically compete in this arms race, nor does it claim to. Division I-A Bowl Classic Series (BCS) powerhouses such as Ohio State or Florida have budgets of $75 million or more. Even the DIA’s loftiest revenue goals would still place San José State -- a non-BCS school -- near the bottom of Division I-A expenditures.

On the other hand, the Spartans First plan does call for doing several of the things explicitly noted by the Knight Commission. For example, the DIA does have ambitious plans to renovate Spartan Stadium, including a Jumbo-tron and other capital improvements. Historically, such renovations have been financed by non-state dollars. If renovations for Spartan Stadium are being planned during this time of budget crisis, the Senate would expect this practice to continue.

In addition, although it is true that the DIA’s budget is quite small in comparison with other programs, its fiscal problems will likely continue unless it grows significantly. The Knight Commission reports that

“just about 15 percent operate their athletics programs in the black. And deficits are growing every year…. A frantic, money-oriented modus operandi that defies responsibility dominates the structure of big-time football and basketball. The vast majority of these schools don't profit from their athletics programs.”

Even former President Robert Caret acknowledged, “Athletics on the Division IA level is out of control. Its total focus has become money” (Hamm 2001). Consequently, SJSU is always under pressure to keep pace with it competitors, whether it relates to athletic facilities, staffing levels or salaries. For example, the Knight Commission noted the consistent pressure to increase coaches’ salaries in order to remain competitive. As a result, coach’s salaries are usually higher – often significantly higher – than faculty salaries. The SJSU Division of Athletics experiences this pressure, and it is seeking to raise coaches’ salaries commensurately (Bell 2002, 11).
In order to cope with its budget difficulties over the years, the DIA has engaged in another practice criticized by the Knight Commission. The Commission notes that many Division I-A universities “have chosen to discontinue sports other than football or basketball to make ends meet. Even some of the ‘haves’ react to intense financial pressure to control costs by dropping so-called minor sports” (Knight Commission 2001, 19). Since 1978, nine different sports have been eliminated at SJSU in the interest of saving money, including the men’s track team that brought SJSU world renown as “Speed City.” Additional sports will be cut soon. The DIA accurately points out that football raises the most money from the Spartan Foundation and brings in the most revenue generally. But it is also the sport with the greatest costs.

Excessive Commercialization – One could not realistically characterize the San José State DIA as “excessively commercial.” It has appropriately sought and obtained partnerships with local and national businesses, but to this point, the program has steered clear of any major controversy over improper payments to athletes, unseemly endorsement deals, or other such money- and recruitment-related scandals that have tainted schools like Fresno State (no author 2002), and the University of Colorado (Good and Crescente 2004). It seems clear that if the DIA is to reduce its share of the general fund budget to an acceptable level while retaining Division I-A status, more such corporate sponsorships must be obtained. In all likelihood, however, this would increase the risks of such abuses.

We are concerned that the DIA advertises alcohol in its marketing materials. For example, beer advertising is prominently featured on printed schedules distributed by the DIA. The sad connection between alcohol abuse and intercollegiate athletics is well documented (e.g. Sperber 2000). The CSU has made combating alcohol abuse among its students a priority (Autumn 2001). In 2002, the SJSU Academic Senate passed and President Caret signed S02-5, which states “alcohol abuse is a serious and growing problem among college students, one that has direct and indirect effects on the health and academic performance of students.” Recently, alcohol-related fights have broken out at SJSU home football games (Lotich 2003). We realize that the DIA must seek external funding. However, we believe that sponsorships from manufacturers of alcohol send a mixed signal to our students and the community and are not consistent with the culture of this university.

QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN THE 1993 REPORT

SS-S93-12 contained a series of questions regarding intercollegiate athletics both in general and at SJSU in particular. We return to many of these questions, although our conclusions have not changed substantially, and reflect the fact that intercollegiate athletics, an “expensive luxury,” has both positive and negative aspects.

1. Can college sports be profitable?

As previously discussed, intercollegiate athletics can be profitable – but only for a select few. San José State has no realistic hope of becoming one of those select few.

2. If you drop athletic programs, do overall donations decline? If SJSU dropped football, would donations decline?

In answer to this question, we agree with the Senate’s conclusion in SS-S93-12 that “The evidence regarding the question is mixed.” Many SJSU alumni continue to feel a connection to the university due to its athletics program – and the football program in particular. This connection moves many of them to donate generous sums of money. The Simpkins family, the Silva family and others have contributed generously to both athletics and academics. If SJSU were to drop its football program, many of these contributions would likely be suspended or ended. In addition, intercollegiate athletics can build ties to community organizations that later translate into benefits for the larger academic community. For example, the Koret Foundation made a $2 million donation toward the construction of the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. library. The
university’s relationship with the Koret Foundation had been initiated several years earlier with the DIA, which obtained a donation for an athletic training facility.

As was true in 1993, however, the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and giving (especially giving to academics) is a complex one, and there is little systematic, empirical evidence to establish a connection between them. Within the CSU alone, several schools have dropped their football programs and suffered no long-term damage in terms of fundraising. For example, Cal State Long Beach is a campus of similar size and composition to SJSU. CSULB dropped its football program in 1991 due to NCAA rule changes and a state budget crisis (no author 1991). Yet today it raises more than twice as much money ($30.8 million in 2002/2003) as SJSU does ($12.3 million). Similarly, Cal State Northridge, SFSU, and Sacramento State – none of which has a Division I-A football team – all generate more external support than SJSU does, despite all being roughly the same size (CSU 2003). Santa Clara University dropped its football program in the early 90s as well, but contributions to the university generally – and the athletics program particularly – are up, not down (Emmons 2002).

3) Can intercollegiate athletics success boost enrollments and/or build school spirit & a sense of community?

There have been documented instances in which a university’s athletics success has resulted in dramatic increases in the number of applicants, a phenomenon known as the “Flutie Factor”. However, such boosts are both rare and short-lived (Sperber 2000). Enrollment patterns at SJSU are far more dependent on social, demographic and economic factors than on the success or failure of any of our intercollegiate teams.

Success in the major sports does have the potential to build school spirit & a sense of community. In 1996, the SJSU men’s basketball team qualified for the NCAA Tournament, and the campus and the community were briefly abuzz with excitement (Slonaker 1996). More recently, the game against Grambling brought a certain amount of excitement and school spirit [although there is good reason to question how many of the people attending the game were actually there to root for San José State (Purdy 2003)].

Unfortunately, however, these occasions have been relatively rare over the past decade, at least for the major sports. The football team has lost more than 2 out of every 3 games it has played over the last twelve years, and has had only one winning season during that time (Sabedra 2002). In addition, the DIA has not done enough to capitalize on its successes to establish a stronger connection with the rest of the campus. Other than during homecoming week, the presence of the intercollegiate athletics barely registers on campus. Partially as a result, attendance at both football and men’s basketball games has been among the very lowest in Division I-A.

In 2002, the NCAA adopted new requirements universities must meet in order to continue playing in Division I-A. One of these requirements is that attendance at football games must average 15,000 per game. In 2002, the team’s marketing efforts did not generate fan interest, and average attendance was 10,360, ranking it 115th out of the 117 teams in Division I-A that year. In 2003, the team met its goal by raising its average attendance to 15,080, rising to 106th place (NCAA 2003). However, this figure is somewhat misleading. The Grambling State game was a sellout – the first SJSU sellout in more than a decade. Attendance at that game alone was 31,681. Attendance at the remaining four home games was very low, averaging 10,969 per game (Bergman 2003). If Grambling had not been a sellout, SJSU would not have come close to meeting the NCAA requirements. Put another way, since the NCAA announced its new attendance rules, SJSU has played nine home games, and attendance has been less (often significantly less) than 15,000 at eight out of those nine games. If the Grambling game is removed from the calculations, attendance at SJSU home football games has increased by only

---

3 This was the attendance claimed by the DIA. However, “[o]nly 26,350 tickets were sold or distributed, but officials counted people who attended a cultural festival inside the stadium grounds” (Sabedra 2003).
8% in two years. Grambling will almost certainly not be playing at SJSU in 2004 (Bergman 2003), placing the team’s quest to meet this attendance requirement at risk. The team must demonstrate much more consistent, much more broad-based support than it currently does to be able to claim that it contributes significantly to school spirit.

To a large extent, the athletics program, with its heavy emphasis on football, does not reflect the values of the majority of the SJSU student body as it exists today. In the past 20 years, the SJSU student body has undergone tremendous transformation, becoming both older and more diverse. “Their efforts to balance child care, employment, freeways, high-rise parking, and classes marginalized college sports….During these years, the largely unrecognized disconnect between the metropolitan university and the athletic tradition became apparent. What tradition preferred to ignore, attendance and gate receipts refused to conceal” (Walsh 2003, 77).

4. Can intercollegiate athletics help build the image of the university in the SJSU service area?

The most visible element of a university to the community at large is often its athletics program, especially its football team. When handled properly, athletic events do provide an opportunity for town-gown interaction. This phenomenon was seen most recently in the successful “Literacy Classic” football game against Grambling State. Apart from the positive press generated from the sell-out game & SJSU’s shutout victory, the game was preceded by a week of activities that brought the university and community together around the theme of literacy (Sabedra 2003). Another recent example was the inspiring return of Neil Parry, an SJSU football player who lost part of his leg in a tragic football-related accident. His story brought heavy and positive local and national attention to the SJSU football program (LaPointe 2003). SJSU has produced world-class athletes such as Jeff Garcia, Tommy Smith, John Carlos, Bill Walsh, Julie Inkster and Dick Vermeil. Many of our teams regularly compete for – and win – WAC and NCAA championships. The men’s baseball and men’s soccer teams can accurately be described as perennial powerhouses.

Media attention is a double-edged sword, however, and the intercollegiate athletics program also brings negative attention to the university. Even apart from the fact that SJSU has had only one winning football season over the past decade, recent incidents have reflected poorly on the university:

- The SJSU football team found itself in a near-brawl after it had taunted members of the opposing team. SJSU then went on to lose by more than 70 points to a fired-up Boise State (Bergman 2003).
- The WAC reprimanded SJSU men’s basketball coach Phil Johnson after an altercation with a fan (Emmons 2004).
- An assistant football coach resigned under pressure after a confrontation with a student (Bergman 2003).
- Athletics Director Chuck Bell and Coach Fitz Hall engaged in a public disagreement about the quality of the football team (Sabedra 2003).

5. Can SJSU athletics provide a focus for other SJSU curricular and co-curricular activities?

Yes. As was true in 1993, “[t]he marching band performs at games. The “Homecoming Game” is the focus of student homecoming activities. KSJS covers SJSU sports; the Spartan Daily typically devotes a page or more to SJSU athletics.”

CONCLUSION

In 1993, the Academic Senate concluded that “intercollegiate athletics is an expensive luxury at a comprehensive university.” Eleven years later, we reaffirm that conclusion. We believe that intercollegiate athletics has a role to play at SJSU. Intercollegiate athletics, and football in
particular, can bring a good deal of publicity, school spirit and alumni support to a university. Most importantly, it also has benefits for many of the student-athletes themselves. But the role of intercollegiate athletics is central to neither the mission of the CSU in general nor SJSU in particular.

Intercollegiate athletics justifies its existence substantially in terms of the amount of external support it can bring to the university. If this justification has any credence, it is only fair to expect that the external community bear the vast bulk of the costs associated with that enterprise. To this point, that has not been the case.

In a time of extreme budget crisis, it becomes difficult to justify such a large general fund contribution to an athletics program that serves a relatively small number of students. If the DIA wishes to retain Division I-A status, it must do so while decreasing its reliance on the state. Given the trends discussed in this report, we are uncertain whether this will be possible at SJSU. However, the experience of Fresno State demonstrates that it is possible to sustain a Division I-A program with a general fund budget that is about half the size (on a proportional basis) of the SJSU athletics budget.
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